DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 136 SO 028 547

TITLE	EURYDICE Seminar on the Role of School Heads in Education Systems. Main Speeches. (Paris, France, June 29, 1995).
INSTITUTION	EURYDICE European Unit, Brussels (Belgium).
PUB DATE	1995-06-00
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	EURYDICE (The European Information Network on Education), European Unit of EURYDICE, Rue d'Arlon 15, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium; Tel: 32-2-238.30.11.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; *Educational Administration; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Instructional Leadership; International Cooperation; Politics of Education; School Administration; School Supervision
IDENTIFIERS	*European Union; *France

ABSTRACT

Three speeches from a seminar include: (1) "Introductory Statement" (Antoine Bousquet); (2) "Objectives and Reforms of the French Education System" (Claude Thelot); and (3) "School Heads in the French Education System" (Louis Baladier). The seminar program and a list of participants also are included. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 424 136

Main speeches of the

EURYDICE SEMINAR ON THE ROLE OF SCHOOL HEADS IN EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Organised by the French Unit and the Eurydice European Unit

Sources d'EUROPE – La Grande Arche
Paris, 29 June 1995

Organised with financial assistance from the European Commission
DG XXII: Education, Training and Youth

SO 028 547

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

De Lel Gisèle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1

EURYDICE
The European Education Information Network

CONTENTS

I. **Foreword** 5

II. **Introductory Statement**

Antoine Bousquet, Deputy Director,
Directorate for General and International Affairs and Cooperation,
Ministry of National Education 7

III. **Objectives and Reforms of the French Education System**

Claude Thélot, Director of Evaluation and Planning,
Ministry of National Education 9

IV. **School Heads in the French Education System**

Louis Baladier, Director of Inspection and Supervisory Staff,
Ministry of National Education. 17

ANNEXES:

Annex 1: Seminar programme 27

Annex 2: List of participants 29

Evaluation and Forward Planning, set the debate back in the current general context of the aims and reforms in the French education system. Monsieur Louis Baladier, Director of Personnel (Inspectorate and Headteachers) concentrated on questions relating to the functions and training of school heads. The afternoon session was devoted to contrasting descriptions of the experiences of two heads of *Lycées* from the *Académie* of Lyon. Unfortunately, because of the very interactive manner in which these were presented, it is not possible to provide a transcript of the second part of the Seminar here.

We hope that this report will enable interested readers to benefit from part of the wealth of information produced by this EURYDICE Seminar. The topic chosen is indeed an important element in the joint reflection amongst Member States of the European Union on developments in European education.

Luce Pépin
Head of the EURYDICE
European Unit

June 1996

EURYDICE SEMINAR ON THE ROLE OF SCHOOL HEADS IN EDUCATION SYSTEMS

"Sources d'Europe" — La Grande Arche

Paris, 29 June 1995

FOREWORD

The Eurydice network was received at the "Sources d'Europe" Centre at the Grande Arche de la Défence in Paris on 19 June 1995 for a seminar on the French education system and in particular on the development of the role of the headteacher. This seminar, which was organised with financial support from the European Commission, was the result of cooperation between the French National Unit, the European Unit of EURYDICE and "Sources d'Europe". It was attended by the heads of the EURYDICE national units from the 18 countries included in the network. The European Commission representative stressed the importance of the topic of the Seminar at European level and more particularly in the context of the projects under SOCRATES, the new Community education programme. The Director of "Sources d'Europe", outlining the role of her centre, emphasised the importance of the work of EURYDICE as a network which had an additional information function and to the synergies which were necessary between activities directed at the same objective.

School heads have a central role in the education systems in the Member States of the European Union. The role of the headteacher as the essential intermediary between political decisions and their implementation in schools is undergoing radical transformation in the context of decentralisation and increasing delegation of responsibility to local level. It is this development of their role which was described and debated on 29 June 1995 on the basis of French experience. In order to introduce a European perspective, the European Unit of EURYDICE had prepared a working document setting out the main features of the functions of headteachers in all the Member States of the European Union. Following checking by the national units, this document later appeared as a network publication.

In addition to the introductory talk, the main speeches made during the morning of the Seminar appear here. Monsieur Claude Thélot, the French Ministry's Director of

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Antoine Bousquet
Deputy Director
Directorate for General and International Affairs and Cooperation
Ministry of National Education, Higher Education, Research and Occupational Integration

The 29 June 1995 is a red letter day. This seminar is the last activity which the French Presidency will conduct before passing the torch to Spain tomorrow. The French Presidency was marked by an event of vital interest to you, namely the Decision on the Socrates programme. This landmark Decision was followed by the adoption of a Resolution on the diversification of language teaching by the European Union and by the initiation of discussions on adult education and mobility for doctoral students. The evaluation of pupils' achievements and teachers' teaching methods comprise one of the essential themes chosen by the French Presidency for discussion at a meeting of Senior Officials. The Eurydice Network will, we hope, take action in all of these areas. You will be kept informed and your input is kindly requested.

The last meeting of the Eurydice Steering Group was held five years ago in 1990. As Head of the French Unit, I often said at the time that there was no Eurydice Network, merely a number of shared interests and an exchange of telephone calls and faxes. The Network was equipped with the somewhat cumbersome question-and-answer system. Since those days, the Network has undergone remarkable development and my rather summary judgement of 1990 no longs holds true. Thanks unequivocally to the efforts of the National Units and the European Unit under the leadership of Luce Pépin, the concept of the Network has survived and, most importantly, has been reaffirmed in the Socrates Decision.

The section devoted to Eurydice is clearly not the only unique point of the Socrates programme, but I would like to emphasise that the confirmation of Eurydice as one of Socrates' leading actions is the fruit of efforts which have been invested over a period of several years. The series of reorientations implemented by the Eurydice Network formed the basis for the proposals which were put forward by the Commission and agreed upon by the Member States and the European Parliament.

In our view, the Socrates programme is also significant in terms of the new features it introduces and the variety of new actions for which it provides a framework. Here I am thinking not only of school cooperation, but of the essential issues I referred to earlier concerning the evaluation of education systems. The Council and the European Parliament have agreed that actions conducted within the Socrates framework will be evaluated two years from now. This evaluation will form the basis for reconsideration of the resources allotted to Socrates. Consequently, the better the cooperation actions and products of the Eurydice Network, the easier the task of the negotiators who, in two

years' time, will need to make a recommendation as to the continuation of the programme.

Without listing all of the projects you have recently undertaken (school failure, the organisation of school time, teacher training and so forth), I would like to stress how much these publications are appreciated. Their quality was recently recognised by the Education Committee. The development of *Eurydos*, the Community database on education systems, is another of your important current projects, one which has been awaited for five years. You have already received an initial prototype, which I have personally observed and tested on computer. *Eurydos* is an extremely useful tool for all of us. The challenge, of course, will be to make it a constantly reliable instrument providing everyone with complete, dependable and consistently up-to-date information to help in decision-making. We also hope that *Eurydos* will use the most modern technology available, but this is less of a technical than an economic issue that you and the European Unit will have to address.

Today you received a concise working document on "School Heads in the European Union" as a basis for discussion. This document was prepared by the European Unit using the information available. It must certainly be expanded, but it once again confirms the Eurydice Network's interest and investment in research conducted on education in Europe. Today's meetings are, of course, devoted to issues concerning school heads. They will also provide an opportunity to clarify activities and reforms undertaken by the French National Education Ministry and to listen to fascinating presentations. You will today have the good fortune to hear two excellent speakers tackle some very important issues. One is Claude Thélot, Director of Evaluation and Forward Planning within the Ministry. You are already familiar with the remarkable publications that this Directorate has produced under Mr Thélot's leadership, including *L'État de l'école*. Mr Thélot also actively participates in the work of the OECD. The other speaker is Louis Baladier, Director of Inspection and Supervisory Staff within the Ministry, who will describe the most recent developments affecting the profession of school head. I say the "profession" and not the "position", as the role of school heads in France has undergone profound development in recent years.

I welcome you to Paris for this first day of meetings, which should reveal the diversity and accomplishments of participants in the Eurydice Network. The Network owes its existence not to mere administrative measures or funding, but to the people who bring it to life. I am very pleased that the French Presidency is closing with this Eurydice meeting.

Let me conclude by extending my thanks to the management of the "*Sources d'Europe*" Centre, particularly to Elisabeth Moulard, for agreeing to host this seminar. It is no accident that Eurydice holds its meetings at "*Sources d'Europe*", as this very dynamic centre promotes the dissemination of information on Europe, giving strong emphasis to issues relating to education and mobility within the Union.

OBJECTIVES AND REFORMS OF THE FRENCH EDUCATION SYSTEM

By Claude Thélot
Director of Evaluation and Forward Planning
Ministry of National Education, Higher Education, Research and Occupational Integration

OBJECTIVES

An education system is defined in terms of its own objectives. One of the difficulties currently facing the French education system is that its objectives are not all that clearly formulated. While we appear incapable of reaching a consensus on this particular issue at present, we do need to be able to engage in productive discussions on our education system and its goals.

The French education system has four basic objectives whose specific results need to be assessed. All developed countries ought to be in a position to evaluate their own education systems, as they are expensive to run and their successful operation has become the key to each country's social and economic competitiveness. Before we can evaluate an education system, we need to know which results we should look at. This in turn assumes that a detailed consideration of the system's objectives has taken place.

The first objective of the French education system is to **transmit knowledge, skills, experience and culture from one generation to the next.** This is a key objective, and current evaluation measures show that it is being well met. In fact, in contrast to what some French intellectuals would have us believe, this objective has never been so satisfactorily met. Never before have knowledge and skills been transmitted so well. The question is more one of determining what kinds of knowledge and which specific skills we are imparting. This is where the arguments start. Should we still include Latin? Should we teach young people how to use computer keyboards? Should we teach modern languages? Even if a general consensus can be reached on what should be taught, conflict remains concerning the type of skills we should include and how, in particular, we can ensure that these skills are well adapted to the demands of the 21st century. To move forward, we must address the issue of curricula and must establish a balance between the different subject areas. Although we may agree on general objectives, we may nonetheless disagree fundamentally (or fail to reach a consensus) on how they should be implemented. This is one of the dire shortcomings of an education system like ours.

The second basic objective is to **prepare young people for working life**. This is not merely a question of preparing their very first years on the job market. From this

perspective, the scandalously high level of unemployment among young people in France today cannot be attributed mainly and certainly not exclusively to failings within the education system. Unemployment is a consequence of the overall condition and functioning of French society and its economy. Nonetheless, the education system must attempt to ameliorate what is an entirely unacceptable situation. Preparing young people for working life means facilitating their first years in the world of work better than is the case now, in other words ensuring that we do all we can to help young people find jobs. But it also means preparing young people for their entire working lives, i.e. for the 30 to 40 years these future adults will spend in employment, by providing them with the kinds of skills and capacities employers are seeking. Employers are looking for social skills as well as technical skills and specific knowledge. They expect the education system to shape future adults to be adaptable, autonomous and creative, capable of working with others (e.g. superiors and subordinates, suppliers and clients etc.), and not only "in teams" as we so often hear. The ability to work with others is what will constitute the basis for individual and collective productivity in our economies over the next 20 to 30 years. These are the kinds of social interactions we need to develop further. Under no circumstances can the French education system alone be expected to deliver these social skills. Other institutions that contribute to the socialisation of young people must carry their own weight, even if they are currently not up to full strength. The family is a weak contributor. The local community is an even weaker one. And private enterprise, too, is weak in living up to its socialisation commitments. These different contributing social institutions must get back on their feet. It cannot be the case in our developed economies of today that schools be expected to do everything when it comes to developing social skills. Such expectations can only set our schools up for failure, as they cannot possibly accomplish this vital task alone. But here again, schools do need to contribute their fair share with respect to certain key skills. However, these core skills are often contradictory to those traditionally prized by the education system, at least when it comes to the education of our elites. Great importance is attributed to individual work in the training of our French elites which is, in certain respects, diametrically opposed to teaching young people how to work effectively with others.

The third major objective, which is highly characteristic of French society, is that **the school be able to serve as the melting pot that brings together all children living on French soil**. The school should shape our future citizens within a democracy which, in France, has assumed the form of a republic. French schools and the French Republic are closely related — a fact of history we need to respect. Schools should socialise young people, of course, but socialise them within our Republic by making our future citizens aware of their rights and obligations. From this perspective, arguing that the *lycée* is either a "place for learning how to learn" or a "place for learning how to live" makes no sense. The *lycée* needs to be both. More than two thirds of final year *lycée* pupils in France are already legal adults. How can the *lycée* not be a place for learning how to live and assume one's rights and obligations in society? In this context, France has succeeded during recent decades in implementing a specific integration model. French society's capacity for integration has been strong in dealing with successive waves of immigration (Italians, Poles, Spaniards, Portuguese, North Africans and Turks). Is this still the case today? It is certainly stronger than many would have us believe (for example, the school careers of immigrants' children are better than they were ten years ago and are better than those of French children from a similar social class). However, it is true to say that integration still appears to be facing major difficulties in a certain

number of our suburban communities. Although the situation of the North Africans is often mentioned, I also wonder about the extent to which Asian families are integrated into French society. While it may be true that the French model has not failed, we should take a closer look at the role schools should play to ensure that the objective of social integration into the French Republic is more effectively achieved.

The fourth objective, adopted since the end of the Second World War, is **to ensure that the education system is fair,** which is to say that any inequalities inherent in the system be reduced as much as possible. It is not a question of seeking to establish an equality of means nor of treating each pupil in exactly the same way. It is more a matter of allowing each pupil to go as far as they can, of enabling mass education to succeed. Nonetheless, our pursuit of this objective should not be allowed to detract from the concept of elite schooling. This is a key point. We must not sacrifice school elites on the altar of mass education. We must ensure that both facets of education are successful. Sport offers an interesting analogy. A good national football team sets itself apart from a rather large number of football players at lower levels of ability. The same principle applies, in part, to the education system, even if this is only a metaphor. Promoting the success of mass education and fostering the selection of an outstanding group of elite pupils assumes a certain amount of unequal treatment. We need to make more means available to the pupils who require them and not give the same means to everyone. We must develop the idea of positive discrimination, not simply in terms of means but also in terms of the approaches we adopt. The pedagogical approaches we apply need not be the same in the suburbs and city centres, or in the classes of immigrant pupils and those of middle-class pupils. In short, the education system needs to be diversified within a national framework and we need to make sure that the concept of fairness in the treatment of pupils is not just an empty phrase.

These general objectives help to explain a certain number of characteristics inherent in the current successes and failures of French schools. Let us take the example of school failure. We have set ourselves the goal that 100% of all children should leave school with at least a minimum level of qualifications. At present, 7% of pupils leave school without having obtained the lowest level certificate, the CAP (*Certificat d'Aptitude Professionnelle*). This kind of school failure affects some 60,000 children, a number which leads us to draw two sets of conclusions. Firstly, this figure is considerably lower than it was 20 years ago when a quarter of an entire generation left school without having received any training whatsoever. Secondly, we never talked about school failure back in 1973 because everyone, including those 25% of school leavers without training, all found a job immediately. The real problem of school failure does not, therefore, actually result from failure at school. It comes from the fact that the demands and expectations of French society, along with other Western societies, have developed significantly. Today, those 60,000 children who leave school without qualifications are in danger of becoming socially excluded. The consequences of school failure are thus much more serious today than ever before. School failure is much less frequent than it may have been 20 years ago but its consequences are far more dramatic. To combat this kind of failure, the Minister has sought to establish a hierarchy of objectives in the education sector.

First and foremost, we must **ensure that young people master the French language**, not necessarily for the sake of the French language but because, in the world we live in,

mastery of our language has become a necessary key asset. Mastery of the French language for all is the starting point for ensuring that diminishing social inequality in schools is not merely an empty concept.

Next we must **provide pupils with the means to complete intellectual tasks**. Children must be able to achieve what is conventionally known as "learning to learn". In the final analysis, young people must have at their disposal the necessary tools to perform intellectual tasks. This was once a highly specific skill which middle-class children picked up spontaneously at home. Now, this skill needs to be imparted to an entire generation. Mastery of the methods of intellectual work is no longer a matter of spontaneous acquisition. Through the instruction we provide, we must therefore be able to teach other things at the same time. Whenever we are teaching one thing, we are also inevitably teaching something else. This is vital point. When 100 years ago French schools required all children to learn all of the French *départements, préfectures* and *sous-préfectures*, they were teaching geography and, through geography, a way of helping children to master spatial concepts and to understand what it meant to be part of the Republic. In providing instruction in a given subject area, teachers are thus called upon to fulfil the additional task of helping their pupils to master the nuts and bolts of intellectual work.

Finally, education must help to **create future citizens who are both responsible and self-reliant**.

REFORMS

In a recent interview with the newspaper Le Monde, the Minister hypothesised that what the education system really needed was to have a continuous concept for reform. If we conceive of our education system as being in a state of constant reform, it is clear that to talk about reforms at any particular point in time can only mean addressing a brief glimpse of what is, in effect, a never-ending process.

Reforms are naturally aimed at the more problematic aspects of the education system, at its frailties and failures. What might be considered the weak points of the French education system today? They can be found above all on two main levels, that of the ***collège*** and that of **entry to higher education**. It is at precisely these two levels that current reforms are directed.

In all countries around the world, the **subject of *collège*-level education** is poorly addressed for two reasons. Firstly, because it covers the adolescent period, a difficult time for young people in general. But then schools are not alone in having a hard time with adolescents. Everyone is hard put, even the adolescents themselves. Secondly, the *collège* takes care of the difficult transition from primary school, where we teach everything to everybody, to the *lycée* and then on to university, where teaching is highly diversified. Some 5 to 10% of our children experience great difficulty upon entering the *collège*. Research conducted on a large scale has revealed that this difficulty is due primarily to a lack of basic skills in French, mathematics and other areas. We have been all too willing to believe that we could avoid having to deal directly with this problem.

We thought we could simply establish heterogeneous classes and the problem would take care of itself. We were wrong. Although it is true that we need heterogeneous classes to ensure that our education systems are more effective (contrary to the beliefs of a great many teachers), this heterogeneity must not be too wide-ranging. We need to adopt specific approaches to tackle the considerable difficulties that pupils encounter at school. Measures must be taken early on, but no matter how early these steps are taken, they must be continued at *collège* level. This is one reason why we are working so extensively on this particular issue.

The second level where we find weaknesses in our education system is when young people **enter higher education**, that is, after the *baccalauréat*. Our capacity to provide guidance upon entry is too weak. As a result, we are allowing too many young people to enter university who subsequently fail. It is not a question of refusing access to higher education. On the contrary, we have elected to develop mass education at higher education level as well. However, we must be careful not to waste the talents of young people who are not cut out for university education. Current failure rates for the first years of university are much too high. We need an effective guidance system which directs y ung people towards the different career paths available in higher education. University is not the only choice beyond the *baccalauréat*. In fact, universities are not even the most developed form of higher education in France. For some 15 years now, the French economy has shown a high demand for young people from upper level classes at the *lycée* who have completed short-cycle higher education studies (bac + 2 years' diploma). Consequently, we need to improve our guidance services and clearly mark each of the career paths in higher education, not just that of the university. We need to ensure better success rates in higher education. This is a particularly difficult task because, although it may be a national necessity, any steps we take are likely to infringe upon the autonomy of universities. The organization of the French education system, and indeed of education systems world-wide, hinges on just how well we succeed in reconciling the divergent needs of national systems and the demands of local autonomy. We will undoubtedly be preoccupied with this important issue for the next 15 years.

The two other links in the French education system, namely the primary school and the *lycée*, have undergone a rather successful series of reforms in recent years. That is not to say that we have not encountered problems or that we have nothing left to accomplish, but the tasks confronting us here appear to me to be less pressing than those at the *collège* and higher education levels.

Finally, we need to **achieve better success rates with respect to technological and vocational training**. The French education system has traditionally looked down on the technological and vocational streams. This disdain held by the elites, coupled with the condescension or ignorance of teachers, has stood in the way of creating a clear distinction between the three streams of general, technological and vocational education. In recent years, the hierarchy between these three streams has been blown out of proportion, dictated more by French society and the economy than by the organization of the education system itself. However, we must ensure that vocational training is not, as it has become today, synonymous with the stream that takes up all those who fail elsewhere. The vocational *baccalauréat*, created in 1985, has helped significantly to rehabilitate the vocational stream. Now it is a question of fostering a general

understanding that the vocational stream and apprenticeships can lead to the pinnacle of professional achievement. This has indeed been one of the greatest reforms in France in recent times. Apprenticeships are no longer solely a means of acquiring the CAP. Today, this path can also lead to an engineering degree. Our task is thus to upgrade the vocational stream, which naturally presupposes that enterprises are able to provide respectable careers for young people who have taken this path. We also have to provide information in terms of clarifying openings and objectives and ensuring that teachers are well informed. At present, teachers do not really know their education system. They are only familiar with the part of the system they completed themselves, i.e. the general education stream. As a result, the guidance provided at the end of *collège* is rarely positive with respect to the vocational stream. Those who fail to succeed elsewhere land here. We need to promote alternating training within the vocational and technological streams because there are certain things one simply cannot learn at school, because alternating training facilitates entry into the working world, and because it offers us an opportunity to hold employers to their word. At the end of the day, we cannot continue living in a French society where employers are forever solemnly avowing their intention to invest in education but where these investments never materialise in an appreciable way. Vocational and technological training is likely to become one of the more difficult areas to manage over the next five years, given French society and its traditions. The legislative framework is already in place thanks to the five-year law of 1993 which laid down the right to vocational training, which attributed extensive responsibilities to the regional levels and which called on all participants in this area to take broad-scale initiatives.

We have seen reforms other than those which only affect education in the strict sense. An education system cannot be reduced to questions of education alone, and by consequence its reform must assume other dimensions. Two reforms, in particular, are of vital importance and take the form of instruments serving the interests of education.

The first reform involves **developing a policy, an approach to management, an attitude, tools and concepts with respect to human resources in the education system which are very different to those in place today**. We must carry our management reform through to the end as regards human resources and teachers, in particular. We need to improve teacher training. Teaching has become a profession. It is not enough to be good at mathematics in order to be a good maths teacher. Competence in the subject area is obviously crucial, but the individuals concerned must be good teachers as well. We need to improve our teacher recruitment procedures. Our recruitment competitions place far too much emphasis on the subject area and not enough on professional requirements. We need to reflect on issues relating to the management, careers, appointments and mobility of teachers as well as on how we can improve teaching success rates. Each of these aspects is still in an embryonic stage of development and will require further modification. The task is far from easy. But the success of an education system is determined within its schools. As a result, we need to develop a human resources policy which is sensitive to the needs of the key players — our teachers and our school heads.

The second reform addresses **the mechanisms used to steer the education system** at all its various levels. Steering means having the means with which to guide and control. In this case, it also means having a clear understanding of what the education system is

all about: knowing what it consists of, what its current status is, what results it is obtaining. We need to carry out an evaluation of French schools. How many pupils are unable to read? How many pupils do not know a certain minimum number of things or act in ways which fail to meet the minimum standards of good citizenship? How many pupils lack the necessary skills to become successfully integrated into the working world? We need to carry out public evaluation in such a way that our open debate on schools is supported by a good knowledge of the education system. Ask any French person in France and you will discover that they are an expert on schools, because they went through school, have children or grandchildren who are there now. Consequently, everyone knows exactly what needs to be done and the public debate has become a shouting match. In short, what we need in order to help our schools is a series of public information, evaluation and planning tools which enable us to structure the public debate and to serve the interests of education policy in an organized way. This is the first step. But the second step is even more important. We need to give the key players within schools, in particular the school heads and teachers, their own steering mechanisms, the means with which they can take action themselves. We need to provide them with the assessment and evaluation tools that will allow them to see how well their pupils are doing. We need to achieve a "mirror effect", enabling teachers to discover the strengths and weaknesses of their pupils and thus to improve their teaching in the light of the very real heterogeneity of their classes. In an effort to promote the success of such a broad-scale evaluation, we have striven continuously to provide evaluation tools to each school, *collège* and *lycée* over the past five years. We need to evaluate our *lycées*, announce publicly the added value each *lycée* offers, enabling the head teachers concerned to reflect on the condition their *lycée* is in and, as a result, to focus their efforts to ensure that this state of affairs improves.

The first broad-scale evaluation we carried out aimed to assess the French language and mathematics skills of some 800,000 eight-year-old pupils. Among other findings, the evaluation confirmed that the children were rather poor at geometry. While this particular problem had already been discussed in seminars and at conferences without having had any practical impact on teaching, the mirror effect this time led to a change in teaching methods. The results were communicated to the 300,000 instructors concerned as "x-percent of the children passed this geometry exercise, y-percent failed", and so forth. The next year, the same broad-scale evaluation revealed that the children had improved their geometry skills. Anecdotes like this lead us to believe that evaluations and the mirror effect they create are the only real way of improving our education systems over the coming 20 years. It is essential that we provide evaluation and guidance tools to the key players and, seeing as we no longer live in the era of Jules Ferry[1] or of an education system based on instructions handed down from above, that we focus our actions entirely on the mirror effect created by these tools for the immediate and tangible benefit of teachers and school heads. By distancing ourselves from day-to-day concerns in this way, we will be able to help our conscientious education professionals who believe in their profession and the aims of schools to improve the effectiveness of their actions and, as a result, increase the overall capacity of our schools to meet their stated objectives.

---

*19th-century French politician active in educational affairs.

SCHOOL HEADS IN THE FRENCH EDUCATION SYSTEM

By Louis Baladier
Director of Inspection and Supervisory Staff
Ministry of National Education, Higher Education,
Research and Occupational Integration

The role of school heads in the French education system is a rather vast subject. To narrow the scope of this important issue, I have decided to address the difficulties the profession faces together with reforms in the area of training, as they relate to some of the paradoxes of the education system.

THE PARADOXES INHERENT IN THE FRENCH EDUCATION SYSTEM

The French education system is characterised by its enormous size, unparalleled anywhere in the world. This extremely centralised system employs 1.2 million civil servants. There are three levels of decision-making between the conception of national education policy and its application. The first level is that of central government, where the Minister of National Education, assisted by a cabinet and directors, defines broad guidelines for education policy. Once these guidelines have been issued, the *recteurs* (chief education officers) of the *académies*[1] are responsible for implementing them within their administrative territory, which can vary in size. They are assisted by *académie* inspectors in the constituent *départements* of the *académie*. The third level is that of schools, where the pupils are. The school head is thus the final link in the chain, the last representative of this centralised authority as concerns the application of policy. Here we encounter the first paradox. Within this highly dense and centralised system, application of policy at establishment level is in fact very liberal, not to say libertarian. In other words, this vast and intensely hierarchical[2] system, which functions only thanks to its extreme centralisation (it is hard to imagine how such a massive technostructure could function otherwise), leaves classroom practice largely up to individual teachers. This freedom very often renders the slightest attempt at harmonisation difficult. For example, the vocabulary used in teaching grammar at *collège*[3] level has proved impossible to standardise from one establishment to the next.

1 France (France and its European and overseas territories) is divided into 28 *académies*.

2 In the sense of a functional and not a military hierarchy.

3 The first cycle of secondary education.

A second paradox is that our highly centralized public education service operates within a country that, for the past 20 years, has been deliberately striving to apply a policy of decentralization in its structure and operations. For example, responsibility for school buildings has been transferred to the regions in the case of *lycées* and to the *départements* where *collèges* are concerned.

RECRUITMENT OF SCHOOL HEADS

Until 1986, supervisory staff were not considered a special category within the education system. Teachers were chosen for supervisory positions from a list of qualified candidates prepared by hierarchical authorities on the basis of need. The procedure was as follows: each *académie* determined how many supervisory staff positions it had to fill (for example, three *lycée* principals, two vocational *lycée* principals, five *collège* principals, 25 assistant heads, etc.). With these needs in mind, *département* or *académie* committees would be formed to assess the candidates. The candidates' names would be placed on specific lists according to their perceived skills; for example, there would be a list of potential principals, one for assistant principals, one for *collège* principals and so forth. These lists were submitted to the national authorities and the Ministry would make appointments.

At that time, no one directorate was specifically responsible for this task. Either a general administrative directorate or the directorate of teaching staff would decide on appointments to particular positions. Consequently, these staff members remained in their original category while being seconded to a particular position; for example, a teacher holding the *agrégation* was seconded to the position of *lycée* principal. The advantage of this system was a relative correspondence between need and demand. Needs were met as accurately as possible. *Académie* authorities defined the needs of their *académies* and recruited staff accordingly. Furthermore, it was relatively easy for administrators to return staff members who did not perform satisfactorily to their original positions. This reassignment to the original job did not constitute a sanction and in actual practice occurred only rarely. However, staff members nonetheless felt that this option of removal from the new post undermined their security. Intense pressure from trade unions led to the creation of a specific category of supervisory staff during the 1980s. This change from a job-based system to a category-based system meant that barring any major professional infraction, staff could remain in the category until retirement. This shift influenced the psychosociology of the profession considerably.

Since then, the situation has changed completely, as supervisory staff are now recruited from within a single category, that of supervisory staff. Recruitment takes place via competition, as throughout the French civil service. Candidates are divided into two main categories of supervisory staff. Category 1 consists of those recruited by examination among teachers with the *agrégation*, while category 2 includes other types of teaching staff (qualified secondary school teachers, *professeurs d'enseignement général des collèges*, chief educational advisors, *conseillers principaux d'éducation*, etc.). The two categories vary considerably in size, comprising about 900 and 12,000 persons respectively.

Until 1995, the examination consisted of a written test and an interview. The written test was intended to assess the candidate's general education and knowledge about the operation of the education system. Those who passed this test were admitted to the oral test. During the interview, the candidate was given a file concerning a specific problem encountered by a supervisory staff member and asked to comment. The objective was to evaluate the candidate's ability to analyse and respond to the situation.

At the request of the trade unions representing supervisory staff, the Minister decided to eliminate the written test. As a result, the examination now consists solely of an oral test, to which candidates are admitted on the basis of their record instead of their results on a written test.

A special directorate has been formed to administer this new category of staff. This directorate, of which I am currently the head, is therefore relatively new. It was created ten years ago and administers the management-level categories of the education system: i.e. supervisory staff, the two major categories of inspection staff and the most senior administrative officials, known as school and university administrative authorities.

ASSIGNMENT OF SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES

The category of supervisory staff is a national category, managed at national level. When staff members pass the competitive examination, they work as trainee supervisory staff members for two years, generally as assistants in a *collège* or a vocational or regular *lycée*. In some rather unusual cases, a trainee chosen from among those scoring highest on the examination, particularly the category 1 examination (for teachers with the *agrégation*), may be given direct responsibility for a school, usually a small one.

During these two years, the trainees learn their profession on the job, in action. At the same time, they receive a more theoretical type of training within "*équipes académiques de la vie scolaire*" (school life academic teams). These are teams of highly respected supervisory staff members who have a great deal of experience. Usually, the trainees remain in the same job throughout the two-year period, unless they have major difficulties or conflicts with the staff there. At the end of these two years, on the basis of the opinions of the trainees' hierarchical superiors and of the inspection staff, they are granted tenure (*titularisation*). Less frequently they are not given tenure, in which case they return to teaching although in some borderline cases their training may be extended for a year.

Trainees are usually tenured in the post they are assigned to for the third year of training. After the three-year period, they become eligible to participate in the national transfer system, which is to say that they may request a change of location or a promotion. They may become fully-fledged school heads or, if they are assistants in a *collège*, be promoted to the post of assistant in a *lycée*. Their requests are considered within the national transfer framework, in the light of the needs of the system and the availability of vacant posts. Of course, there is also competition between the candidates for the more attractive posts.

The first assignment is determined mainly by the needs of the system. After tenured staff members have been promoted, a certain number of posts remain vacant. Trainees are then assigned to these posts. The trainees' wishes are taken into account only if they are compatible with the needs of the system. This severe limitation of choice is compensated for by the guarantee of housing wherever staff members are assigned. Next, requests for transfer from the entire country (mainland France plus the overseas *départements* and territories) are considered. The Minister takes decisions after consulting with the joint bodies, i.e. committees wherein staff and administrative representatives issue an advisory opinion. Various criteria are taken into account, including job performance as noted in the candidate's records, and how closely the candidate's profile corresponds to the requirements of the post. For example, even an extremely brilliant young candidate would not be assigned, as a beginner, to a school considered difficult, unless the candidate had demonstrated a particular bent for a similar type of situation during training or in a first post. In addition to these qualitative factors, seniority, family situation and other personal considerations also come into play. Overall, although this approach may not be absolutely equitable, assessments based on all of these criteria nonetheless almost always result in satisfaction for both the administration and staff members.

Here a clarification concerning recruitment of women needs to be highlighted. In France, we are seeing an increasing predominance of women in the teaching profession. Almost 70% of teachers at primary level are women. However, curiously enough, an inverse proportion of women are found among decision-making and supervisory staff. I can assure you that this situation is not the result of a decision by the administration but of the fact that the overwhelming majority of candidates for these supervisory posts, even today, are men. In any case, recruitment procedures — based on competition — are identical for both sexes. However, it is true that when decisions are taken concerning the transfer of supervisory staff, national education authorities request, in some specific situations, that a man be assigned to particular post, at least temporarily. The reasons for this request are usually explained, and aside from this measure, completely insignificant in statistical terms, there is no discrimination on the basis of sex in the management of supervisory staff.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL HEADS AND THE CHALLENGES THEY FACE

Outside of this new framework, the rules regulating supervisory staff have changed little. Supervisory staff, and more particularly the school head, have two main tasks. Firstly, the person responsible for a school is the final link in the hierarchical chain. Within the school, the head is the Minister's representative, or as we say in France, "*un functionnaire d'authorité*" (an official vested with authority). A share of government sovereignty, in proportion of course to the particular level of authority, has been delegated to the head. School heads exercise this authority by performing vital tasks such as authorising the budget, drafting assessments of staff under their authority and other similar duties. The head also speaks for the education community – i.e. all of the staff of the school — and perhaps also for the community of pupils before the hierarchical authorities. The hierarchical authorities closest to the school head are essentially the *académie* inspector and the chief education officer.

School heads have for some time had very wide-ranging general regulatory responsibilities. However, decentralization within the country has considerably increased the de facto duties of school heads. Their jobs have become much more complex and have never been as difficult as they are today. Three main developments have contributed to this current situation.

The first is a general trend in France, and probably throughout the West, towards a withdrawal and weakening of institutional authority. For a very long time, the title of principal automatically conferred authority. There was no serious challenge to this authority, as the school head, by virtue of function and title, was invested with all of the institutional authority of the system. Today this no longer holds true.

The second development is the increasing complexity of education-related problems resulting from a veritable revolution in the French education system in the late 1960s. Only 30 years ago, the French state education system was still an extremely selective system based on very early assessment and assignment of pupils into various streams. As recently as 1954, only 27% of pupils in a particular age group attended secondary school. All other pupils left the education system after primary school, either immediately afterwards or following a period of "upper primary" schooling. They then went directly into the workplace, where, at the time, there was still room for them. In 1960, the government decided to make education compulsory up to age 16, meaning that all pupils not enrolled in special education (for those with psychological or behavioural problems) would attend secondary education. This measure was not immediately welcomed, as its quantitative impact — the need for many more schools — was obvious from the outset. Yet the expansion of secondary education was an absolutely extraordinary cultural revolution, a move away from a system based on the elimination of as many pupils as possible. It is no exaggeration to say that up until the 1950s, the examination for admission to the 6th class served as an admission test for upper secondary education. Of the mere 27% of all pupils who attended secondary school, more than 90% completed higher education studies.

Unfortunately, until the "orientation law" of 1989, the pedagogical consequences of the switch from an ultra-selective system to mass education had never been assessed. Practices within the system remained unchanged, creating a new problem that has proved very troublesome to French society today, namely school failure. Large numbers of pupils pursue, to no benefit, and complete a course of study that leaves them stranded on the margins of society, particularly in terms of employment. This cultural revolution, the heritage of the 1960s, now poses a very difficult challenge to French society, that of moving beyond the provision of mass secondary education — which has already been achieved — to the democratization of education from which everyone can effectively benefit.

Supervisory staff and in particular the school head are fighting these problems on the front lines, to use a military analogy. Ministers, directors, general inspectors and even chief education officers represent the generals huddled over a map of the battlefield. The school head is the field officer fighting in the trenches, i.e. the schools. All recent experience shows that no matter how excellent the battle plan, if the troops break ranks, the result will at best be a stand-off; at worst, disaster. In nearly all schools, supervisory staff are in the first ranks, because they now have to deal with the demands of managing

a diverse school population. This important consideration signifies the end for a centralized operational unit in our country.

When the school population was subject to selection, when only 27% of primary pupils were admitted to secondary school, the problems tended to be of a similar nature throughout the country. A *collège* in Romorantin, one in the suburbs of Le Havre and another in the 15th arrondissement of Paris faced more or less the same difficulties. During the reign of Napoléon, Louis de Fontane, a famed university professor, could take out his watch and tell the Emperor that "right now, at 2:30 on Friday afternoon, pupils in every classroom in the Empire are labouring over Saluste", even specifying which sentence they were translating. This is a far cry from the situation of today, not so much because the system has changed (it in fact retains many Napoleonic features), but because the heterogeneity of school populations requires an analysis of the specific needs of each class within each school. Now that all pupils go on to secondary school, there are enormous differences between schools. Some take in a large number of non-French-speaking pupils from varied social backgrounds. In other schools, many pupils are failing. Some schools are situated against an affluent cultural background, others in a relatively deprived one.

Only the school head can really take all of these factors into account. One of the head's fundamental responsibilities is therefore to adjust Ministerial policy to the specific needs of the school, instead of applying it as handed down by the chief education officer, *académie* inspector or inspection officials. The head must become a pedagogical leader, an education official of the first degree.

With the social and political decentralization of the country, local elected officials are less likely to deal directly on educational matters with the chief education officer, who is headquartered in the "capital" of the region, and even less likely to have contact with the Minister than the *académie* inspector of the *département*. Moreover, supervisory staff become the focal point of an extremely important network of relationships. This network is broadly involved in a range of decisions concerning the school, from provisional plans for the creation of training courses to those for equipment, repairs, construction, expansion and so on.

The third development contributing to the difficulty of the school head's role, also related to general social changes, is the fact that the users of the state education system are beginning to act more and more like consumers of education. They expect the education system to provide high-quality services, an expectation that is not unjustified, although it sometimes takes undesirable forms. These "consumers" are not always aware of the need for their cooperation. Educating children is not like manufacturing tins of sardines. The work of an education system is slightly more subtle and refined than that. Changing contexts and situations also mean that these consumers' demands are increasingly expressed in an aggressive or threatening manner. Much more often than in the past, supervisory staff are considered personally and legally liable for security problems.

Supervisory staff now face conflicts and difficulties arising from an increasing number of sources. As concerns relations with local officials, their responsibilities have increased in number and significance. There is a pressing need for the school head to act

as a pedagogical authority figure. In short, the profession has never had to face so many challenges at once.

A RELATIVE SHORTAGE OF CANDIDATES

Although the competition is open to all teachers and tenured guidance counsellors, many potential candidates hesitate to leave teaching for a job that is vastly more challenging. It is not condescension toward teachers to say that there is no comparison between their work and that of supervisory staff. Supervisory staff members must be a constant presence in the school and are very often caught in the middle of conflicts that are difficult to defuse. They have burdensome responsibilities of many types, including legal and financial ones. Teachers are therefore often reluctant to apply for supervisory positions.

This reluctance may explain the current recruitment crisis. Another reason may be that the increasing difficulties associated with the profession have been accompanied by a "relative loss of prestige", without trying to coin a phrase. There are now more school heads, and the differences in the pay and benefits of supervisory staff from those of teachers are not as great as might be assumed, given the responsibilities, constraints and commitment of time involved. Last winter, of course, agreements concluded between the Ministry and organizations representing supervisory staff improved the situation somewhat, but not to any significant extent.

Other reasons linked to the psychology or idiosyncrasies of the members of the national education system may explain the relative shortage of candidates for management posts. This shortage is relative, as it is not quantitative. Each year, about 700 new supervisory staff members are recruited via competition from among some 3,000 candidates. The competition therefore remains genuinely competitive in quantitative terms. The real problem lies in the candidates' level of qualification. The most highly qualified teachers are increasingly losing interest in these positions. Ever fewer teachers holding the *agrégation* participate in the category 1 competition. Filling 50 posts from a pool of 55 to 60 candidates does not constitute a competition.

Noting that the teachers holding the highest qualifications are not entering these competitions does not imply a value judgement concerning the candidates' qualifications. It does not mean that the best candidates do not apply, but if the most highly qualified teachers are losing interest, and without overemphasising the value of diplomas, it is obvious that problems will arise if the school head is the least qualified member of staff in terms of educational qualifications. This is not yet occurring but the danger exists. At any event, I am personally convinced that professional quality, in terms of the ability to perform the tasks of a school head, is largely unrelated to the number of diplomas an individual has. Nonetheless, a problem of labelling within the system does exist.

In France, supervisory staff members are increasingly being recruited exclusively from among tenured teachers or the education profession, i.e. the educational counsellors formerly known as "*surveillants généraux*" (general supervisors), who perform the duties of assistant heads. For the moment, mainly because of the trade unions' position

on these issues, the pool for recruitment of supervisory staff is limited to these staff categories — perhaps another reason for the relative shortage of candidates.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING

The difficulty of attracting the most highly qualified teachers into supervisory posts is mounting. The system must take more effective measures to resolve this problem than it has in the past, concerning the training of supervisory staff. For this reason, a higher institute for supervisory staff in national education has been created to replace the current centre for training inspection and supervisory staff. This decision does not - at least I hope it does not - constitute merely a change of name, but a change in the approach to training.

Good quality training is currently perceived as training for a new profession. We take teachers or educational counsellors and we teach them new techniques: how to manage a budget, how to analyse a financial year, a few legal concepts, how to draw up a timetable. All of these skills are obviously necessary, but are still inadequate to make the candidates fully aware of the true implications of the job. I am entirely convinced that the system's ability to undergo a genuine democratization over the next few years will depend mainly on school heads. Successfully integrating all of the pupils who come to us into the school population will be mainly, if perhaps not exclusively, the responsibility of school heads. If the public education system does not meet this challenge, its very survival in its present form will surely be threatened. The various laws adopted, including the orientation law of 1989, stipulate very clearly that all pupils must leave the education system with some type of qualification. Such laws are not vague statements of intent, but declarations of the obligations of the state education system. If the current rate of school failure continues into the year 2000, the situation will be even more critical than it is today. This is a very basic issue, and if school heads are to fill the decisive role imposed upon them, they must assume a true sense of responsibility and a genuine understanding of the implications far exceeding those required for technical management of a pedagogical unit. In other words, supervisory staff must view themselves as vital agents of the national policy of the education system by exercising, at the appropriate level, complete mastery of all aspects of this policy.

This new institute must succeed in fulfilling this task by establishing a convergence that does not yet exist within the system between the efforts of supervisory staff who apply a policy and those of inspection staff who monitor the quality of service provided. The relationship between these two categories of staff should not be one of antagonism, wherein one group imposes limits and the other dictates what would be ideal. They must work in unison, sharing the same concept of responsibility. The objective of creating such an institute is to continue to prepare teachers to perform the tasks required in the profession and to cultivate an attitude of responsibility that will make it easier for them to enter various categories of supervisory posts later on. The opportunity to move from one category to another will enable staff members to benefit from the wealth of experience involved in a variety of duties.

IN CONCLUSION

In addition to the various problems already discussed, a sort of aporia within the system complicates the work of school heads still further. An aporia, in Greek tragedy, is a situation with no apparent remedy, composed of insurmountable contradictions. The French education system is faced with a certain aporia, or at least a very striking paradox, a new and extremely well-entrenched paradox. The education system, rightly enough and in total legitimacy, is responsible for teaching pupils, educating them and endowing them with critical faculties. Such a system is naturally, in its very essence, legitimately opposed to control, to the imposition of rules, to supervision. Consequently, the task demanded of supervisory staff is almost impossible to fulfill (fortunately only "almost" impossible). This task is to exercise, "in the field", at the heart of the sensitive and critical realities of the system, a kind of supervision, guidance and control in an environment where such notions are by definition anathema. To carry out this extremely difficult task, the system must, I believe, create a new conceptual tool which could be described, using the words of Montaigne, as "*le ménagement des ressources de l'établissement*" (handling a school's resources). Such phrasing allows us to avoid using the franglais term "management".

As one of Fellini's films illustrates, an orchestra may be composed of virtuoso musicians but if the conductor is absent, the result is total cacophony. At the end of the day, supervisory staff should not be jacks-of-all-trades constantly metamorphosing from one role to another throughout the day, but conductors who are able to lead their orchestras no longer simply because they are sanctioned by authority, but because their skills enable them to gain an awareness of pupils' needs. This ability is of course to some extent linked to personality, but it is mainly acquired, I hope, during initial and in-service training.

Henceforth, a focus on pupils' needs will be the vital point of departure for any pedagogical programme. A pre-conceived approach no longer has any chance of working with all pupils. Any frontal attack is doomed to failure, at least as concerns 60 to 70% of pupils. As Article 1 of the orientation law states, the pupil must be the starting point and the focus of the education system. Many people considered this principle self-evident. They were mistaken, because in France, it is not. Pupils must adjust to the system, and not vice versa. Even today, in many establishments, the timetable and the assignment of pupils to classrooms is based not on pupils' needs, but on teachers' convenience and a desire to appease their trade unions.

The concept of school projects was introduced over ten years ago. The basic idea behind the school project was and remains the definition of school policy based on the needs of pupils and the integration of national objectives in terms of these needs. School projects are now nowhere to be found, however. At best, they have become education action projects (PAE), i.e. specific actions that are often valuable but never involve the entire education community. The concept of school policy is probably outdated and in need of replacement. But in reality, school policy means caring for these resources and dealing with the inevitable constraints.

Many partners are involved and it is unlikely that we will be able to come up with reforms that satisfy everyone. One example is the issue of class size. In France, there is

one teacher for every 17 pupils at secondary level. Unless someday everyone in France is either a teacher or a pupil (an unlikely situation), it is hard to see how needs could be better met. The teacher/pupil ratio in primary schools is 22.5, which means that some classes have 30 pupils, others only ten. No major effects of such differences have been observed. It has been known for some time, throughout Europe, that except in extreme cases, there is no correlation between class size and pupils' performance. Many studies have confirmed this finding. Nonetheless, those involved in public discourse in France continue to intone, as a credo, that the only possible improvement to the education system would involve decreasing class size by providing more teachers, in blatant disregard of scientific evidence to the contrary.

A major report by the general inspectorate examined ongoing reforms from the 1950s to the present. After describing all of these often very intelligent initiatives, the report comes to the disturbing conclusion that little has changed in the classroom. Reforms stopped at the classroom door. Strategic decisions are taken in places too far removed from the realm of application. As a consequence, it is at establishment level, under the responsibility of the school head, that the "handling" of resources, of constraints and of the school environment can most effectively be oriented towards greater efficiency of action, which must sooner or later be assessed in terms of its effectiveness as well. Although it may be difficult to implement such a process of assessment[1], we are making great strides in this area. The results thus obtained go far towards correcting our impressions and very often prove how far discourse has strayed from reality.

I believe that in the future the school head will be viewed as a resource manager facing numerous challenges. At the turn of the century, Péguy said that fathers were the last adventurers of modern times. Today we could easily say that school heads are the last adventurers in our school system. This is why it is so important to recruit people capable of embarking on this adventure.

1 See the paper by C Thélot for more detail.

Annex 1

PROGRAMME

SEMINAR ON THE FRENCH EDUCATION SYSTEM

"School Heads"

"Sources d'Europe" Centre — La Grande Arche, Paris

Thursday, 29 June 1995

9 a.m.	Reception and registration of participants at "Sources d'Europe".
9.30-10.15 a.m.	Opening ceremony by: . Mr. Antoine Bousquet, Deputy Director of Administration, International Affairs and Cooperation, Ministry of National Education, Higher Education, Research and Occupational Integration (*Ministère de l'Education nationale, de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et de l'Insertion professionnelle*); . Ms. Elisabeth Moulard, Director of "Sources d'Europe"; . Ms. Alice Fracchia, European Commission (DG XXII).
10.15-11.15 a.m.	Objectives and current/ongoing reforms in the French education system: Mr. Claude Thélot, Director for Evaluation and Forward Planning, Ministry of National Education, Higher Education, Research and Occupational Integration (*Ministère de l'Education nationale, de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et de l'Insertion professionnelle*).
11.15-11.30 a.m.	Coffee break
11.30 a.m.-12.30 p.m.	The head teacher in the French education system: Mr. Louis Baladier, Director of Administrative and Inspection Staff, Ministry of National Education, Higher Education, Research and Occupational Integration (*Ministère de l'Education*

nationale, de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et de l'Insertion professionnelle).

12.30-14.30 — Lunch in the area of *La Défense*.

2.30-3.30 p.m. — Guided visit of the "Sources d'Europe" Centre.

3.30-5.30 p.m. — The role of the head teacher: The responsibilities and experience of two heads (*proviseurs*) of upper secondary schools (*lycées*) in the education administration area of Lyons:

- Ms. Mimi Barry, head of the *lycée* Léon Blum (Lyons);
- Mr. Alain Voldoire, head of the *lycée* Honoré d'Urfé, Saint-Etienne.

8 p.m. — Dinner at "Le Procope" restaurant in the Latin Quarter, at the invitation of the Minister of National Education, Higher Education, Research and Occupational Integration (*Ministère de l'Education nationale, de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et de l'Insertion professionnelle*).

EURYDICE SEMINAR ON SCHOOL HEADS
Paris, "Sources d'Europe" 29 June 1995

SÉMINAIRE EURYDICE SUR LES CHEFS D'ÉTABLISSEMENT
Paris, "Sources d'Europe", 29 juin 1995

List of participants
Liste des participants

I. NATIONAL UNITS: UNITES NATIONALES:

Austria Autriche	Elfriede TAJALLI Stefan POLZER
Belgium (Fr) Belgique (Fr)	Dominique BARTHELEMY
Belgium (Nl) Belgique (Nl)	Vera Van RENTERGHEM
Belgium (De) Belgique (De)	Edgar HUNGS
Denmark Danemark	Lis THOMSEN Per BILLESØ
Germany Allemagne (Bund) (Länder)	 Monika SIMON Gerdi JONEN
Spain Espagne	Enrique ROCA COBO Rosario NAVARRO
Finland Finlande	Camilla EKLÖF Risto HELLE
France France	Antoine BOUSQUET Thierry DAMOUR Solange DESSERRE
Greece Grèce	Antigoni FARAGOULITAKI Véronique ZOGRAPHOS
Iceland Islande	Kristin JONSDOTTIR Brynhildur JONSDOTTIR

Ireland Irlande	Caitriona HENNESSY Sean NOLAN
Italy Italie	Daniela NENCI Antonella TURCI
Luxembourg Luxembourg	Raymond HARSCH
Netherlands Pays-Bas	Pauline SPRENGERS Rob JANSEN
Norway Norvège	Arne GUNDERSEN Jan-Peter STROSHEIM
Portugal Portugal	Rosa ANTUNES Miguel MONTEIRO
Sweden Suède	Karin HENRIKSSON Bodil BERGMAN
England and Wales Angleterre et Pays de Galles	Joanna LE METAIS
Scotland Ecosse	Hope JOHNSTON

II. EUROPEAN COMMISSION:
COMMISSION EUROPEENNE:

Alice FRACCHIA FERNANDEZ

III. EUROPEAN UNIT:
UNITE EUROPEENNE:

Luce PEPIN
Arlette DELHAXHE
Maria Luisa GARCIA
Massimo EZZY

IV. OBSERVERS:
OBSERVATEURS:

CEDEFOP:	Michael ADAMS
COUNCIL OF EUROPE: CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE:	Sheila TANNER